

**BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND**  
**RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM**

**FISCAL YEAR 2015-16**

**Request for Proposals, Number 2015-12**

**Guidelines for Submission**

**Industrial Ties Research Subprogram (ITRS)  
and  
Proof-of-Concept/Prototype (P-o-C/P) Initiative**

*This RFP excludes the R&D Awards to Louisiana Artists and Scholars (ATLAS) Subprogram, and the R&D Research Competitiveness (RCS) Subprogram with/Pilot Funding for Research (Pfund). The ATLAS RFP is Number 2015-10, RCS with/Pfund RFP is Number 2015-08)*

**P. O. Box 3677**

**Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70821-3677**

**(225) 342-4253**

**<https://web.laregents.org>**

## **REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS, NUMBER 2015-12**

### **Important Notices**

#### **Electronic Submission of Notices of Intent and Proposals**

The ITRS and P-o-C/P proposals will be submitted through the Louisiana Online Grant Automation Network (LOGAN). The instructions for submitting notices of intent and proposals electronically are available at <https://web.laregents.org/support>. For help with electronic submission, please email [support@laregents.org](mailto:support@laregents.org).

#### **Inquiries about this RFP**

In accordance with R.S. 39:1503, written and oral inquiries about this request for proposals (RFP) will be accepted until 4:30 p.m., October 15, 2015, or until 4:30 p.m. of the first working day following this date. To ensure that all interested parties receive the same information no inquiry will be accepted--whether written or oral--after that date.

#### **Suggestions for Improvements in this RFP**

The Board of Regents actively solicits constructive suggestions about ways in which this RFP can be improved. All such suggestions must be received no later than October 15, 2015 to be considered prior to the issuance of the next RFP.

#### **Board of Regents' Commitment to Reform-Based Undergraduate Education and Teacher Preparation**

At its May 22, 1997, meeting, the Board of Regents reaffirmed its commitment to the reform of undergraduate education and teacher preparation and encouraged all Support Fund program applicants to consider these priorities as they develop proposals. Further, Board staff will make all external reviewers aware of the Board's commitment to undergraduate reform and teacher preparation. Reviewers will be instructed that, when all else is equal, preference should be given to those proposals which emphasize, in a meaningful manner, reform-based undergraduate education and teacher preparation.

#### **Availability of the RFP on the Internet**

As part of the Board's ongoing effort to streamline RFPs, and to ensure that this document is as widely disseminated as possible while minimizing the number of paper copies that institutions must produce, this RFP is available on the Internet: <https://web.laregents.org> under Downloads -"RFPs, Policies and Forms."

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|  | <u>Page</u> |
|--|-------------|
| <b>I. General Information</b>  | 1           |
| A. Basis of Authority  | 1           |
| B. Purposes of the Board of Regents Support Fund   | 1           |
| C. R & D Program Administrator; Questions About This RFP   | 1           |
| <b>II. Types of R &amp; D Subprograms</b>  | 1           |
| <b>III. Industrial Ties Research Subprogram with Proof of Concept/Prototype Initiative</b>                                       | 2           |
| A. Objectives  | 2           |
| B. Eligibility Considerations and Requirements   | 2           |
| 1. Eligible Faculty  | 2           |
| 2. Eligible Institutions   | 3           |
| 3. Eligible Activities   | 3           |
| 4. Eligible Disciplines and Targeted Industry Sectors  | 3           |
| C. Monetary Limitations  | 4           |
| D. Project Duration  | 4           |
| E. Funds Available   | 4           |
| F. Cost Sharing, Matching Commitments, and Indirect Cost Rate  | 4           |
| G. Institutional Screening Committee   | 5           |
| H. Assessment of Proposals by Out-of-State Experts   | 5           |
| 1. Subject-Area Reviews  | 5           |
| 2. Final Panel Evaluation  | 5           |
| I. Final Selection of Proposals to be Funded   | 6           |
| J. Debriefing  | 6           |
| K. Timetable   | 6           |
| L. Evaluation of Funded Projects and Reports Required  | 7           |
| M. Previous Submissions and Requests for Continuation Funding  | 7           |
| 1. Requirements for Previous Applicants  | 7           |
| 2. Requests for Continuation Funding   | 7           |
| <b>IV. Procedure and Deadline for Submission of Notices of Intent &amp; Proposals</b>  | 7           |
| A. Notices of Intent   | 7           |
| B. Proposals   | 7           |
| <b>V. Proposal Requirements and Format</b>   | 8           |
| A. General Requirements and Stipulations   | 8           |
| 1. Limitation on Number of Research Proposals That May Be Submitted  | 8           |
| 2. Submission Requirements   | 8           |
| 3. General Format Stipulations   | 8           |
| 4. Addenda Submitted Before or After Receipt of Proposal   | 8           |
| 5. Guidelines for Identifying, Labeling and Certifying the<br>Confidential Nature of Information Contained in Research Proposals | 8           |
| 6. Guidelines for Proposals Involving the Use of Human Subjects or Vertebrate Animal   | 9           |
| B. Specific Requirements and Format  | 9           |
| 1. Cover Page  | 9           |
| 2. Project Summary   | 9           |
| 3. Goals and Objectives  | 9           |
| 4. Narrative and Bibliography  | 9           |
| 5. Budget and Budget Narrative   | 11          |
| 6. Current and Pending Support/History of Support  | 14          |
| 7. Biographical Sketch   | 14          |
| 8. Proposal Appendix   | 14          |
| <b>Appendix A: Sample Proposal Evaluation Forms</b>  |             |

## **I. GENERAL INFORMATION**

### **A. BASIS OF AUTHORITY**

Article VII, Section 10.1 of the Louisiana Constitution established two funds in the State Treasury: the Louisiana Education Quality Trust Fund (hereinafter referred to as the Trust Fund) and the Board of Regents Support Fund (hereinafter sometimes referred to as the Support Fund). The Trust Fund was established with approximately \$550 million received from settlement of disputed oil and gas revenues generated in the so-called 8(g) stipulation of the Federal Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act. Twenty-five percent of the interest earned from investment of monies in the Trust Fund, as well as 25% of recurring 8(g) oil and gas revenues, will continue to be returned to the Trust Fund, until it reaches a cap of \$2 billion. Each fiscal year the remaining 75% of the interest earned and 75% of the recurring oil and gas revenues are placed in the Support Fund for appropriation by the Legislature.

Funding for the Opportunities for Partnerships in Technology with Industry (OPT-In) program provided through the BoRSF in conjunction with the EPSCoR cooperative agreement between Louisiana and the National Science Foundation (NSF) can no longer be continued under the new NSF TRACK 1 anticipated to start FY 2016. Funding for proof-of-concept and prototyping functions of OPT-In will continue through the BoRSF under the R&D Industrial Ties Research Subprogram and Proof-of-Concept/Prototype (P-o-C/P) Initiative.

### **B. PURPOSES OF THE BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND**

On an annual basis, Support Fund money is divided equally between the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (BESE) and the Board of Regents (hereinafter referred to as the Board) for higher education. According to Article VII of the Constitution, the funds available for higher education from the Support Fund are to be utilized “. . . as that money is appropriated by the Legislature and allocated by the Board of Regents for any or all of the following higher educational purposes to enhance economic development:

- i. the carefully defined research efforts at public and private universities in Louisiana;
- ii. the endowment of chairs for eminent scholars;
- iii. the enhancement of the quality of academic, research, or agricultural departments or units within a university; and,
- iv. the recruitment of superior graduate students.”

The Article further stipulates that “The monies appropriated by the Legislature and disbursed from the Support Fund shall not . . . displace, replace, or supplant other appropriated funding for higher education . . .”

Reflecting these Constitutional mandates, the Board of Regents Support Fund policies affirm that awards in all categories will be based on the following considerations:

1. the potential for the award to enhance the overall quality of higher education in Louisiana; and
2. the potential for the award to enhance the economic development of the State.

### **C. R & D PROGRAM ADMINISTRATOR; QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS RFP**

Specific questions concerning this RFP and the requirements set forth herein should be directed to Ms. Zenovia Simmons, R & D Program Manager ([zenovia.simmons@la.gov](mailto:zenovia.simmons@la.gov)) at (225) 342-4253. In compliance with R. S. 39:1503, questions will be accepted and answered until October 15, 2015 (or until 4:30 p.m. of the first working day following this date). As soon as possible after that date, all questions asked about this RFP and answers provided in response to these questions will be posted on the Board of Regents Sponsored Programs website, <https://web.laregents.org>. To ensure that all interested parties receive the same information, no inquiries, whether oral or written, will be accepted after the deadline date.

## **II. TYPES OF R & D SUBPROGRAMS**

The Board of Regents Support Fund R & D Program consists of three subprograms: Industrial Ties Research Subprogram (ITRS) with Proof-of-Concept/Prototype (P-o-C/P) Initiative, the Research Competitiveness Subprogram (RCS) with Pilot Funding for New Research (Pfund) component, and the Awards to Louisiana Artists and Scholars (ATLAS) Subprogram. Potential applicants should be aware that: (1) the requirements for research proposals vary, depending upon the subprogram or component in which they are

submitted; (2) several sets of criteria have been established to evaluate these proposals; and (3) the ATLAS and RCS with Pfund component are administered under separate RFPs, available on the Sponsored Programs website. See in-depth evaluation forms for research proposals in Appendix A for the criteria that will be used to evaluate proposals submitted in the appropriate subprogram or component.

### III. THE INDUSTRIAL TIES RESEARCH SUBPROGRAM with PROOF-OF-CONCEPT/PROTOTYPE INITIATIVE

#### A. OBJECTIVES

##### **Industrial Ties Research Subprogram (ITRS)**

The specific objective of the ITRS is to fund research proposals with significant near-term potential for development and diversification of Louisiana's economic base. Accordingly, all proposals submitted in this subprogram should show evidence of involvement of the private sector. Applicants who anticipate submitting proposals in non-science or non-engineering areas should see the note at the end of this section.

The ITRS is also a stimulus program. To be funded, proposals must provide evidence that the project will: (1) involve significant private-sector or Federal funding or, at a minimum, develop a plan to greatly increase the likelihood of receiving Federal or private-sector funding in the near future; or (2) result potentially in the enhancement or establishment of a Louisiana business or industry which will attract significant revenues to the State. All faculty at Louisiana institutions of higher education, including senior researchers, who have research ideas that might promote significant near-term economic development in Louisiana are encouraged to apply. In the case of proposals in non-science and non-engineering areas (e.g., tourism), private-sector involvement is not necessarily a requirement, if the applicant can justify the reason for lack of involvement. The stimulus/leveraging concept is relevant, however, and non-science/non-engineering proposals must, at a minimum: (1) present a plan to leverage Support Fund monies in the manner most appropriate to the proposal; and (2) demonstrate how the project will promote and/or enhance economic development in the State.

##### **Proof-of-Concept/Prototype Initiative (P-o-C/P)**

The specific objective of P-o-C/P is to solicit science and engineering (S&E) proposals from the State's tenured, tenure-track, or full-time research professors seeking funding to enable proof-of-concept activities and/or prototype development with research commercialization and technology transfer potential; and contribute to the economic development of Louisiana. Since the goal of P-o-C/P is to advance innovation toward commercialization, proposals for basic research projects that do not further advance commercial development of an innovation will not be considered.

#### B. ELIGIBILITY CONSIDERATIONS AND REQUIREMENTS

1. **ELIGIBLE FACULTY:** Only tenured, tenure-track or research professors employed on a full-time basis by an eligible Louisiana institution of higher education may act as principal or co-principal investigators. **An eligible faculty member may serve as a principal or co-principal investigator on a maximum of two ITRS, two P-o-C/P, or a combination of two projects at any one time.** Individuals who are not eligible to serve as principal or co-principal investigators (e.g., out-of-state scholars, scientists, and/or engineers or employees of industry) may serve as consultants on applications; however, they may not be listed as principal, co-principal, or other (senior advisory faculty) investigators and must not be cited on the cover page of the proposal. Section III.A of this RFP provides more information on the type of researcher targeted in the ITRS and P-o-C/P component.

Principal investigators who are delinquent in submitting contractually required reports for prior or existing Board of Regents Support Fund and/or Federal awards managed by the Board of Regents Sponsored Programs Section are precluded from submitting a proposal in response to this RFP until the required report(s) has been received and accepted by the Board.

2. **ELIGIBLE INSTITUTIONS:** Board policies stipulate that all Louisiana public institutions of higher education and those independent institutions of higher education which are members of the Louisiana Association of Independent Colleges and Universities are eligible to compete under the Support Fund R & D Program.
3. **ELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES:**

**(ITRS):** Board policies further stipulate that both basic and applied research proposals that have the potential for contributing to the State's economic development will be considered. Potential applicants should be aware, however, that R & D program funds must be used for research. For example, proposals will not be considered that are designed only to: (1) keep museums and/or laboratories open; (2) add to collections; (3) fund conferences or workshops; (4) purchase instrumentation; (5) provide services; (6) provide money to support ongoing operating costs of existing or proposed programs, entities, or projects; or (7) support literature reviews and/or develop protocols.

**(P-o-C/P):** Proposals to support proof-of-concept and/or prototype development related to an innovation which has been previously disclosed and is actively managed by the institution's Technology Transfer Office (TTO) and has high potential for commercialization and technology transfer to an existing or spin-off company. Any proposal for a project to develop a previously disclosed innovation which is either (1) subject to an unexpired obligation under any university grant or contract, or (2) already licensed or optioned to a company at the time of application for an P-o-C/P grant, are not eligible and will not be considered.
4. **ELIGIBLE DISCIPLINES:**

To align the Support Fund more closely with the State's emerging economic initiatives while targeting scarce resources for maximum effect, a modified approach will be followed beginning in FY 2016, in which all disciplines/focus areas are eligible for funding consideration in ITRS and P-o-C/P provided the project meets subprogram/component goals. However, preference will be given to those applications that are submitted in areas that have been identified as targeted industry sectors (see **Table I**). Potential applicants should note that: (1) the topic of the research proposal should be used to determine eligibility under **TABLE I**, and not the academic training of the potential applicants.

**TARGETED INDUSTRY SECTORS:**

To capitalize on Louisiana's existing research strengths and plan strategically for future investments, the Board of Regents 2011 Master Plan was organized around three major goals, including "fostering innovation through research in science and technology in Louisiana". To pursue this goal, the Regents in 2012 established the Master Plan Research Advisory Committee (MPRAC), comprised of representatives from public and private research-focused universities across the State charged with finding priorities for investing in university research which shows promise of leading to technology transfer and research commercialization. MPRAC, in collaboration with the Louisiana Department of Economic Development (LED) and the consultants LED engaged from Battelle during 2012-13, conducted analyses of priority research areas to identify a limited number of potential statewide foci, which are listed below. To pinpoint opportunities for innovation within the designated areas, MPRAC established five corresponding Task Forces. Task Forces completed reports in October 2014, each recommending no more than three priority areas for research investments. The Board of Regents subsequently charged the Statewide Research Priorities Review Panel with reviewing the Task Force reports and preparing findings and recommendations to the Regents. The areas addressed by each Task Force, in further refining the priorities recommended by Battelle, are of great significance to Louisiana and that targeted investments will likely lead to both short- and long-range returns for the citizenry of the State. The Board has adopted these recommendations.

---

**TABLE I**  
**TARGETED INDUSTRY SECTORS**  
**BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND**  
**INDUSTRIAL TIES RESEARCH SUBPROGRAM**  
**PROOF-OF-CONCEPT/PROTOTYPE INITIATIVE**

---

1. **Advanced Materials and Manufacturing**
  2. **Life Sciences and Bioengineering**
  3. **Digital Media and Enterprise Software**
  4. **Coastal and Water Management**
  5. **Clean Technology and Energy**
-

### **C. MONETARY LIMITATIONS**

ITRS: No applicant may seek more than \$350,000 over a three-year period. The total request for the first year may not exceed \$150,000, and the total request for each successive year may not exceed \$100,000. Applicants should be aware, however, that the average first-year ITRS award in FY 2014-15 was \$62,114 with first-year awards ranging from \$44,226 to \$82,309.

P-o-C/P: No applicant may seek less than \$10,000 or more than \$40,000 for a one-year period.

### **D. PROJECT DURATION**

No applicant may seek more than three years of support under the ITRS or one year of support under P-o-C/P.

### **E. FUNDS AVAILABLE**

The FY 2015-16 Support Fund Plan and Budget allocates \$585,000 to fund new awards in ITRS and \$350,000 for new P-o-C/P awards. The Support Fund, however, has in recent years received substantially less income than projections indicated; thus the actual amount available for new awards across R & D subprograms may be reduced.

### **F. COST SHARING, MATCHING COMMITMENTS, AND INDIRECT COST RATE**

For all equipment requests under the ITRS subprogram and P-o-C/P Initiative, the submitting institution must provide, and cite on the appropriate budget page(s), a cash match equal to or greater than 25% of the total cost of the requested equipment. Review panels will have authority to recommend to the Board that any R & D application requesting funds for equipment, but lacking the required equipment match, be reduced or not funded.

In calculating the Support Fund request, an indirect cost rate of 25% will be permitted only on salaries, wages, and fringe benefits. If provided as institutional match, indirect costs may be calculated using the submitting institution's federally negotiated rate.

Potential applicants and university officials should note that any institutional cost-sharing commitments are binding. For this reason, the Board of Regents strongly encourages institutions of higher education to make only those commitments that they can realistically meet. Institutions should also be aware that discounts received on equipment purchases are not eligible for inclusion as part of an institutional match.

Applicants and their fiscal agents should be aware that cost sharing and matching commitments of any kind (e.g., private-sector, federal, institutional) which are pledged in the proposal must be honored in full if the proposal is funded at the requested level. Depending upon consultants' recommendations, matching commitments may have to be honored in full even if the award level is reduced. Support Fund money will not be forwarded until appropriate written assurances of all matches and cost sharing promised in the proposal have been received, reviewed, and approved by the Board's staff. Further, electronic submission of the proposal by the campus serves as certification to the Board that the fiscal agent is aware of the claimed commitment(s) and has determined said commitment(s) to be consistent with all applicable guidelines, regulations, and/or statutes. Similarly, the fiscal agent's signature, which is required on the budget page(s) of funded projects, is a certification to the Board that commitments pledged in the proposal have been honored. All matching funds must meet the same tests of allowability as Support Fund money which is expended.

#### ITRS:

All ITRS applicants are required to have an "up front" matching commitment from the private/federal sector for at least the first year of the request. A plan to secure subsequent-year matching commitments must be addressed in the budget section of the proposal. If all other criteria are equal, it is likely that those applicants with strong matching commitments will fare better than those lacking these commitments. Grants, awards, and "in-kind" contributions received prior to **June 1, 2015**, may not be applied toward any matching commitments required during the contract term. Additionally, applicants should be aware that inclusion of a private-sector entity as both an industrial partner and a paid consultant/subcontractor represents a potentially serious conflict of interest and is therefore not permitted, except when the participation of a private-sector entity in both roles is essential to conducting proposed research. The proposal must clearly and strongly justify this circumstance and submit a letter signed by the President/Chancellor of the submitting institution certifying that this vendor is the only provider for services to be supported with BoRSF funds. Lastly, any investigator listed in the proposal who has any financial affiliation with a private-sector supporter must fully disclose this affiliation and provide a certified letter signed by the institution verifying that no significant conflict of interest exists. Failure to report this information may result in disqualification of the proposal.

P-o-C/P:

A letter of support from the PI's Department Chair, College Dean, or Center Director that reflects commitment of the necessary time and effort to achieve the goals of the project is required. Letters of interest/support from potential users/developers/investors of the prototype are strongly encouraged.

**G. INSTITUTIONAL SCREENING COMMITTEE**

Proposals should be carefully screened by a campus committee to ensure that no conflict of interest exists (as defined in the "Code of Governmental Ethics," R.S. 1950, Title 42, Chapter 15, as amended) and that only the most meritorious proposals from each campus, which meet objectives and eligibility requirements as defined in this RFP, are submitted to the Board.

Electronic submission of the proposal by the institution is considered a guarantee that no conflict of interest exists and that the proposal: (1) has been reviewed and approved for submission to the Board by all appropriate institutional officials who regularly are required to review proposals submitted for external review, including the submitting organization's authorized fiscal officer; (2) has met the objectives and eligibility requirements of the subprogram in which it was submitted as described in this RFP; (3) is in the format required by the Board; and (4) where appropriate, has been reviewed by officials within a particular system to ensure that the proposal does not duplicate research currently or formerly funded on a member campus.

**H. ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSALS BY OUT-OF-STATE EXPERTS**

Board policies stipulate that proposals submitted to the Board of Regents for funding consideration will undergo a merit review by out-of-state experts in the priority areas. Considerable care will be taken to ensure that these reviewers are: (1) expert researchers in their fields; (2) impartial evaluators; and (3) selected, when appropriate, from both academic and non-academic settings.

A separate review is conducted for ITRS subprogram and P-o-C/P. The review process for the ITRS subprogram will consist of a subject-area and final panel review; the P-o-C/P component will consist of a single panel review by experts in specified targeted industry focus areas. All Panels may suggest budgetary revisions as they deems necessary and appropriate.

1. Subject-Area Reviews

ITRS: Out-of-state experts familiar with the area of research will review each proposal. Subject-area reviewers are required primarily to assess (a) the extent to which a given proposal meets the criteria of the subprogram under which it was submitted; and (b) using national standards of excellence, the quality and relative merits of the proposed research and research plan.

P-o-C/P: Out-of-state experts familiar with targeted industry focus areas will review each proposal application independently; panel members will reach a consensus as to a rank order of prioritization of the proposals recommended for funding and submit a report to the Board reflecting the consensus. (See Appendix A for sample in-depth evaluation forms.)

2. Final Panel (ITRS):

A team of out-of-state experts will prepare a report which ranks all proposals included in the subject-area review. In arriving at its conclusions, this panel considers the objectives and guidelines for the subprogram, the scores and comments from the subject-area reviewers, and any additional pertinent written comments.

The final panel may also consider certain information provided by economic development experts at the Louisiana Department of Economic Development (LED). These experts will be asked: (1) to review certain portions of each proposal included in the subject-area review (the project summary and the information included in section V.B.5.a, "Rationale of Project," of this RFP); and (2) to comment on the extent to which proposals appear to have significant potential for the development and/or diversification of Louisiana's economy. Applicants should note that the information provided by LED is simply another piece of information that the final panel may or may not use in arriving at its decisions. Individuals from LED do not convene with the final panel, nor are they involved in recommending projects for funding. Even though LED may believe a project has high potential for economic development and/or diversification, the final panel is directed to disregard that information if it believes either that the project: (1) is not scientifically meritorious and technically feasible and sound; and/or (2) does not appear to have significant potential for economic development and/or diversification.



**NOTE:** In light of matching requirements instituted in this RFP (i.e., a 25% of cost minimum cash match for all equipment requests and an "up-front" private-sector and/or federal match for ITRS proposals), ITRS and P-o-C/P panels will be advised that, although they may not recommend that a higher level of matching commitment be required, they may--at their discretion--recommend that a project not be funded or be funded at a reduced level based on the appropriateness of its matching commitments.

#### **I. FINAL SELECTION OF PROPOSALS TO BE FUNDED**

After receiving recommendations of out-of-state experts, the Board of Regents decides which proposals will be funded. **The Board of Regents staff, acting on behalf of the Board, sets documentary requirements for the processing and execution of contracts resulting from proposals approved for funding by the Board.**

#### **J. DEBRIEFING**

Copies of rating forms completed by out-of-state experts will be provided to affected applicants in July 2016.

#### **K. TIMETABLE**

Contingent upon Board and Legislative action, the following schedule for submission, assessment, and approval of grants through the Support Fund R & D program will apply for FY 2015-16. **If the following date(s) falls on a Saturday, Sunday, or holiday, the deadline(s) will be extended until 4:30 P.M. Central time of the next working weekday:**

|                                    |   |
|------------------------------------|---|
| July 2015                          | Request for Proposals Issued  |
| September 11, 2015, 4:30 p.m., CST | Notices of Intent Due through LOGAN   |
| October 15, 2015, 4:30 p.m., CST   | Last Day that Potential Applicants May Ask Questions About the RFP                                |
| October 31, 2015, 4:30 p.m., CST   | Deadline for Receipt of ITRS and P-o-C/P Proposals through LOGAN                                  |
| November 2015 – March 2016         | Proposals Transmitted to and Reviewed by Out-of-State Experts                                     |
| April 2016                         | Reports and Recommendations of Out-of-State Experts Forwarded to Institutions of Higher Education |
| April 2016                         | Final Action by the Board   |
| May – June 2016                    | Contracts Negotiated and Executed   |
| July 2016                          | Dissemination of Debriefing Information   |

#### **L. EVALUATION OF FUNDED PROJECTS AND REPORTS REQUIRED**

The Board of Regents requires that institutions receiving monies from the Support Fund report periodically on the utilization of these monies. All programs supported by the Fund will be reviewed at least annually. Data and information collected for review will vary depending upon the type of activity involved, but all information necessary to assess the effectiveness of each project will be gathered. As appropriate, the services of out-of-state consultants may be utilized in the evaluation process.

Periodically, the Board of Regents will conduct a comprehensive review and evaluation of each funded project. At a minimum, annual progress and financial status reports will be required of the principal investigator.

#### **M. PREVIOUS SUBMISSIONS AND REQUESTS FOR CONTINUATION FUNDING**

1. **REQUIREMENTS FOR PREVIOUS APPLICANTS:** Submission of a notice of intent and a research proposal in a previous funding cycle does not relieve the applicant of the requirements set forth in this RFP of submitting another notice of intent and full proposal if he/she wants the same or a similar proposal to be considered in the current funding cycle. This rule holds true regardless of whether the proposal was among those that were considered meritorious and recommended for funding by a peer review panel. The Board always receives far more research proposals that are worthy of funding than it can fund. Additionally, the fact that a proposal was recommended for funding in a previous year is not an indication that the proposal will automatically be funded in the next funding cycle, even if another notice of intent and full proposal are submitted.
2. **REQUESTS FOR CONTINUATION FUNDING:** Except for those principal investigators whose projects are currently being funded and/or to whom multi-year research contracts have been awarded, all principal investigators who received funding in the past for a particular research project and who want to continue that same project or a very similar project must submit another notice of intent and full proposal in the fiscal year in which they desire continuation funding. If the continuation request is for a project which has been completed, a copy of the final report must be included in the appendices. If the continuation request is for a project which is ongoing, the research proposal must contain a separate section which describes progress to date.

All continuation requests must compete on an equal basis with all other projects submitted for funding consideration in the year in which the continuation request is submitted. If the proposal survives the screening process, out-of-state experts participating in the review panels will be told to base their funding recommendation on their evaluations of both the new proposal and the information concerning past progress, whether it be the final report provided by the principal investigator or a progress and financial status report provided by the Support Fund R & D Program staff.

#### **IV. PROCEDURE AND DEADLINE FOR SUBMISSION OF NOTICES OF INTENT & PROPOSALS**

##### **A. NOTICES OF INTENT**

Before a full proposal will be accepted, the applicant must first submit a completed notice of intent form for each research proposal to be submitted. The notice of intent must be submitted via LOGAN to the Board of Regents by 4:30 p.m. Central, September 11, 2015. One of the primary purposes of the notice of intent is to assist the Support Fund R & D Program staff in identifying potential reviewers based on the targeted areas of focus.

**NOTE:** All rules, regulations, and limitations in the RFP for ITRS and P-o-C/P research proposals (e.g., limitations on the maximum amount of funds that may be requested per annum, the number of proposals that may be submitted, etc.) also hold true for notices of intent. “Note that both notice of intent and proposal submission processes include two steps: submission by the PI to the campus, and campus approval with submission to the Board or Regents; a proposal cannot be accepted by the Board until both steps are completed.”

##### **B. PROPOSALS**

Full proposals must be submitted via LOGAN to the Board of Regents by 4:30 p.m. Central on the due date set forth in section “III.K. Timetable” of this RFP. After the applicant submits the completed proposal to his/her designated campus office via LOGAN, he/she will receive a sequence of three emails: (1) immediately following the applicant’s submission to the campus, confirmation of receipt of the electronic proposal by the campus; (2) following institutional approval and submission, confirmation that the Regents have received the proposal; and (3) as soon as possible after the subprogram submission deadline, an indication of whether the proposal

has been submitted in compliance with RFP instructions or disqualified for lack of compliance. The campus will be copied on all confirmations.

If necessary, the title of the proposed research and the amount of funds requested in the notice of intent may be changed slightly when the full proposal is submitted. The subprogram or component and focus area under which the proposal is submitted, however, must be the same as that under which the notice of intent was submitted.

### **C. COMPLETION AND SUBMISSION OF MATERIALS ON OR BEFORE CITED DEADLINES**

Submission deadlines are absolute; all campus work on the proposal, including final approval and submission to the Board of Regents by the designated campus office, must be completed on or before the deadline date and time. The online proposal submission system is programmed to close at the deadline(s) cited in this RFP.

### **V. PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS AND FORMAT**

The following requirements and format for research proposals must be followed closely. Proposals which do not adhere to these guidelines will not be accepted for noncompliance and eliminated from funding consideration.

#### **A. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS AND STIPULATIONS**

**NOTE:** The applicant is responsible for ensuring that the proposal is complete and correct upon submission to the Board, and no changes may be made to any proposal after the submission deadline. Disqualification of a proposal and/or any reviewer misunderstandings that occur because proposal contents (including all required forms) are incomplete, out of order, or contain incorrect information are solely the responsibility of the applicant.

1. LIMITATION ON NUMBER OF RESEARCH PROPOSALS THAT MAY BE SUBMITTED: An applicant may submit a maximum of two research proposals in the ITRS or two P-o-C/P or combination of the two with the applicant listed as "Principal or Co-Principal Investigator"; however, the same or similar proposal/s may not be submitted under both ITRS and P-o-C/P in the same competitive cycle. An applicant may be listed as "Other Investigator" on additional proposals in the ITRS or P-o-C/P.
2. SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS: The NOI and proposal must be submitted via LOGAN. The LOGAN submission system may be accessed at <https://web.laregents.org> by clicking LOGAN on the menu at the top of the page.
3. GENERAL FORMAT STIPULATIONS: All narrative sections of the proposal must be presented in a single PDF document with pages numbered, 1-inch margins at the top, bottom and on each side, and in type no smaller than 12 point. Forms must be completed and proposals submitted via LOGAN.
4. ADDENDA SUBMITTED BEFORE OR AFTER RECEIPT OF PROPOSAL: Proposals submitted to the Board must be complete upon submission. No addenda (e.g., letters of support) will be accepted after receipt of the proposal or separate from the LOGAN submission.
5. GUIDELINES FOR IDENTIFYING, LABELING AND CERTIFYING THE CONFIDENTIAL NATURE OF INFORMATION CONTAINED IN RESEARCH PROPOSALS: Without assuming any liability for inadvertent disclosure and except for purposes of evaluation, the Board of Regents will limit dissemination of, or access to, information certified to be of confidential or proprietary nature which falls into a category described by R.S. 44:4(16), as long as the following conditions and assurances have been met and guidelines have been followed:
  - a. The information to be protected must accompany the full proposal and each component of the information to be protected must be clearly and conspicuously identified and marked as confidential. Revisions, amendments, and addenda will not be accepted after the proposal has been submitted or separate from the LOGAN submission.
  - b. A letter must be included in the appendix which:
    - i. Briefly explains and certifies the need for confidentiality;
    - ii. Contains complete identification and mailing addresses of all entities (faculty or staff members, private or public

- concerns) which have a right to, or ownership of, the confidential information;
- iii. In the case of public institutions of higher education, provides assurance that this request is in accordance with the rules and regulations adopted by the institution's management board with respect to R.S. 44:4(16); and
  - iv. Is signed by all entities identified in V.A.5.b.ii.

- c. The information to be protected and the letter described in V.A.5.a. and V.A.5.b. must be reviewed by the chief administrator of the applicant's university or his/her designee, and he/she must certify in writing that the information is of a confidential or proprietary nature which falls into a category described by R.S. 44:4(16). This signed certification must be included in the appendix.

A person or entity wishing access to documents and/or records as defined previously in this section may request such access by making a specific request to the researcher(s) and any other entity having a proprietary interest. Concurrence among all entities having a proprietary interest is required prior to release of information previously deemed confidential. In cases of denial of a request for access to protected information, the only recourse is an appeal through a court of law. The Board of Regents does not assume any liability for the release of protected information when the release is ordered in accordance with State or Federal laws.

#### 6. GUIDELINES FOR PROPOSALS INVOLVING THE USE OF HUMAN SUBJECTS OR VERTEBRATE ANIMALS

- a. Use of Human Subjects. Consistent with the relevant Federal policy known as the Common Rule for Behavioral and Social Science Research (*Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects*, 45 CFR 690), Board-sponsored projects involving research with human subjects must ensure that they are protected from research risks. All proposals involving the use of human subjects either must have approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) before an award is made, or affirm that the IRB has declared the research exempt from continued oversight. Therefore, applicants are strongly encouraged to consult with their institutional IRB during proposal planning and preparation; and prior to proposal submission.
- b. Use of Vertebrate Animals. Consistent with the requirements of the Animal Welfare Act [7 U.S.C. 2131 et seq] and the regulations promulgated thereunder by the Secretary of Agriculture [9 CFR, 1.1-4.11], the Board requires that proposed projects involving the use of vertebrate animals for research or education be approved by the submitting institution's Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) before an award can be made. Therefore, applicants are strongly encouraged to consult with their institutional IACUC during proposal planning and preparation.

For proposals involving the use of vertebrate animals, sufficient information should be provided within the narrative and bibliography (see V.B.4), or in the proposal appendix, to enable reviewers to evaluate the choice of species, number of animals to be used, and any necessary exposure of animals to discomfort, pain, or injury. **It is no longer necessary, however, to complete the process of IACUC approval unless and until the proposal is recommended for funding.**

If the proposal is recommended for funding, a letter of approval for intended human/animal protocols by the appropriate IRB or IACUC involving experiments (i.e., surveys, etc.) with human subjects and/or animal subjects **must** be provided prior to contract execution. Also, if applicable, any changes in protocols from that contained in the original proposal should also be indicated and accompany the assurance of IRB/IACUC approval.

#### **B. SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS AND FORMAT**

For access to LOGAN submission instructions, go to <https://web.laregents.org> and click LOGAN on the menu at the top of the page.

- 1. COVER PAGE: The form is available and must be completed in LOGAN.
- 2. PROJECT SUMMARY: The project summary may contain a maximum of 250 words and must be entered in the appropriate section in LOGAN.
- 3. GOALS AND OBJECTIVES: The final goal to be reached by the end of the grant period, as well as annual goals for any intervening years, must be clearly specified. Major changes in research programs and/or scientific personnel that can be expected when these goals are achieved must be described. This section of the proposal must be no longer than the equivalent of one, single-spaced, typewritten page and uploaded to LOGAN as a separate .pdf document.

4. **NARRATIVE AND BIBLIOGRAPHY:** The proposal narrative must be uploaded to LOGAN as a PDF and adhere to the following requirements: The narrative should be succinct and must not exceed fifteen (15) single-spaced pages (ITRS) or ten (10) pages (P-o-C/P) with a type size of 12 point or greater. Pages must have 1-inch margins and be numbered. Reviewers are not required to read additional narrative pages. Information applicable in multiple places may be referenced by page and paragraph. The narrative should conform to the following outline, including all major sections and subsections. If a section or subsection does not apply to the project, include the appropriate heading followed by "Does not apply." Proposal reviewers will assign points based on the quality and specificity of each section. For multi-institutional proposals, as appropriate throughout the narrative section, explain the multi-campus agreement(s) in the context of shared funding, resources, arrangements by which the various institutions will share the benefits of the proposed project, and/or cost savings to the State. Also provide documentation in the proposal appendix describing the exact nature of the agreement between/among the institutions involved.

**NOTE:** The fifteen (15) page narrative (ITRS) and ten (10) page narrative (P-o-C/P) limits do not include the bibliography. The bibliography shall not exceed two (2) pages.

**a. Rationale of the Project**

ITRS Proposals Must Include:

- i. A description of the relationship of the proposed research to significant near-term economic development and/or diversification in Louisiana, including a description of the target economic sector for which the research is proposed; potential for the proposed research to remedy problems identified in this economic sector; the manner in which the results will foster economic development or diversification (e.g., the transfer of research results, private-sector/industrial linkages, etc.); and the potential impact of the research if successful (e.g., the research has a broad national/international market, would create new jobs, would allow for the stabilization of an existing industry, etc.).
- ii. A detailed description of private-sector/industrial participation in the project, including past, scheduled, and potential scheduled or potential contacts with industry or the private sector. Contributions of funds, equipment, and services by the private sector on a past, scheduled, or potential basis must also be described in detail.
- iii. Identification of an existing industry that will utilize proposal results or of a new industry that will be created as a result of the proposed research.

In the case of non-science and non-engineering disciplines (e.g., tourism), the rationale should include a description of how the proposed research will enhance/promote economic development in the State. It is understood that the impact of the proposal may be direct or subtle, depending on its focus; however, to the extent feasible, applicants should respond to the items described in this section.

- iv. Include projected mechanisms to transfer results of research to economic development or diversification. Additionally, where appropriate, a technology transfer certification describing the specific actions that have been taken to protect intellectual property and license the technology must be included. The certification must also indicate any spin-off companies that have been formed as a result of the project. This certification should be provided by the technology transfer officer or other appropriate administrative officers of the institution of higher education.

**NOTE:** The information provided in response to this section of the RFP (V.B.4.a) must also be provided with the abstract of all proposals, either as an integral part of the abstract itself or as an attachment.

P-o-C/P Proposals Must:

- i. Describe proof of concept activities to be undertaken or prototype to be built, the work that has already been performed, and the status of disclosures, patents, etc.;
- ii. Describe the project's significance relative to commercialization, creation of spin-off companies, and economic development both in and out of the State;
- iii. Discuss the market for the product(s) to be developed;

- iv. Provide a statement of work, listing the major tasks to be carried out, a timeline with milestones for accomplishing the tasks, and expected outcomes; and
- v. Describe next steps after the P-o-C/P project is completed and specific plans for further development after the concept has been proven and/or the prototype has been built and tested.

**b. Research Plan**

Both ITRS and P-o-C/P Proposals Must:

- i. Briefly summarize the expected significance, methods, limitations, and relationship of the study to the present state of knowledge in the field and to comparable work in progress elsewhere;
- ii. Provide a schedule of proposed activities with benchmarks indicated throughout the proposed grant period;
- iii. Provide performance measures which indicate how the Board of Regents or other entity will determine whether the project has been a success and the degree to which it has achieved its goals;
- iv. Include plans for publications (ITRS) and a description of how the level of competitive research achieved during the period of the Board's grant will be maintained after funding ends; and
- v. Include projected mechanisms to transfer results of project activities to economic development or diversification. Additionally, where appropriate, a technology transfer certification describing the specific actions that have been taken to protect intellectual property and license the technology must be included. The certification must also indicate any spin-off companies that have been formed as a result of the project. This certification should be provided by the technology transfer officer or other appropriate administrative officers of the institution of higher education.

**c. Involvement and Qualifications of Investigators, Other Faculty, and Students**

Qualifications of investigators to undertake the proposed research should be indicated. A brief statement should be included that describes the responsibilities of each person involved, the amount of time/effort each person will devote to the project, whether release time will be given and, if so, the amount, type, and duration of release time (see also Section V.B.5.d for information on salary requests).

A description of any supportive and/or interdisciplinary expertise needed to enhance the potential success of the research, including joint research activities with other researchers or research groups at the same or other institutions, must be included.

If funds for graduate or undergraduate assistants, postdoctoral appointments, visiting faculty, etc., are requested, their roles in accomplishing objectives of the project must be clearly defined.

**d. Institutional Capabilities and Commitment**

Institutional capabilities and commitment with respect to the proposed research must be described, including available facilities and major items of equipment especially adapted or suited to the proposed research.

**e. Bibliography**

5. BUDGET AND BUDGET NARRATIVE: (Also see Section III.F of the RFP relative to cost sharing commitments, matching commitments, and indirect cost rates.)

Budget forms must be completed in LOGAN. Corresponding budget narratives are required and will be uploaded separately.

In ITRS, the amount of Support Fund money requested for successive years of a research project should decrease or as the investigators secure private-sector funding.

**a. Format**

A completed budget must be submitted in LOGAN for each year for which support is requested. A corresponding budget narrative must be provided for each year which fully explains every item for which the expenditure of Support Fund money is proposed. **A full line item explanation of institutional cost sharing and/or matching support must also be included.** A cumulative budget will automatically be generated from the annual budget. No cumulative narrative is required.

**NOTE:** All matching funds for which the principal investigator has received a commitment from an external source and which are cited in the text of the application must be listed on the budget page and explained in the budget justification section. This is especially crucial for applications submitted into the ITRS, for which industrial/private-sector support is an important consideration in funding decisions.

**b. Project Activation Date and Anticipated Date of Completion**

ITRS

The project activation date is June 1, 2016, and the termination date is no later than June 30 of the year in which the principal investigator envisions the project should terminate, not to exceed a total of three years. No-cost extensions may be requested to complete project activities per Louisiana R. S. 39:1514. This statute specifies that “contracts or amendments to existing contracts issued to institutions of higher education under the authority of the Board of Regents to awards for educational purposes with funds available from the Louisiana Quality Education Support Fund, the Louisiana Fund, and the Health Excellence Fund may be entered into for periods of not more than six years. However, such contracts may be extended beyond the six-year limit up to an additional two-year period provided no additional costs are incurred.”

P-o-C/P

The project activation date is June 1, 2016, with the project completed within a maximum of 13-months from the start date, or June 30, 2017. No-cost extensions will be considered only upon request in exceptional circumstances for a maximum period of one year, with sufficient justification and documented evidence of continued progress towards defined project milestones.

**c. Disallowed Budgetary Items**

As indicated in Section I.B of this RFP, “Purposes of the Board of Regents Support Fund,” Article VII, Section 10.1, of the Louisiana Constitution stipulates that “The monies appropriated by the Legislature and disbursed from the Support Fund shall not ... displace, replace, or supplant other appropriated funding for higher education...” Applicants must make a case in their proposals that what they are proposing does not violate this stipulation. Applicants should also be aware that the Support Fund Program staff will make the final panel of out-of-state evaluators aware of this Constitutional prohibition, as well as the current economic climate for higher education in Louisiana. The panel will then be asked to develop recommendations relative to whether providing Support Fund money for specific proposals under serious consideration would violate this constitutional stipulation. Board of Regents Support Fund money may not be used to support regular, ongoing operating costs of existing or proposed programs, entities, or projects.

The scope of the Support Fund R & D Program also does not permit: (1) purchase of office furniture or routine office equipment (e.g., standard desktop computers for faculty offices); (2) construction of facilities; (3) maintenance of equipment, whether existing or purchased through the Support Fund; (4) routine renovation, expansion in size, or upgrading; (5) compensation of faculty from the submitting university to train other faculty at the same university, or faculty at other universities who are a part of an interinstitutional project; or (6) similarly, the payment of honoraria to faculty, whether they are involved in or external to the proposal, to learn how to use Support Fund-purchased equipment. Faculty professional development time in question should either be provided as part of the institutional match or donated by the faculty concerned.

Support may not be requested for shortfalls or deficits in budgets, scholarships or tuition, augmentation of salaries of individuals pursuing regularly assigned duties, or unspecified contingencies. Finally, funds may not be requested for proposed centers or institutes which require Board of Regents approval prior to their establishment and which have not been previously approved.

Potential applicants should note that funds may be requested for foreign travel. If the project is funded, however, permission for foreign travel must be obtained from the Division of Administration, as stipulated in the State General Travel Regulations. Discounts received for equipment purchases are not eligible as part of the institutional match.

Only under exceptional circumstances may Support Fund dollars be used to support institutional memberships to business, technical, and/or professional organizations. Individual faculty memberships to any of the above are disallowed.

All costs for telephone, faxing, email, telegraph, and postage are disallowed. Costs of printing annual/progress reports to the Board of Regents are disallowed.

**d. Funds for Project Personnel**

**Principal Investigators**

Requests for academic year salary support are to be based on the investigator's regular compensation for the continuous period which, under the policy of the institution concerned, constitutes the basis of the investigator's salary. Summer salary requests are to be at a monthly rate not to exceed the base monthly salary multiplied by the number of months for which summer salary is to be paid. All salary paid by ITRS/P-o-C/P must be accompanied by a pledge of equivalent release from regular duties by the institution.

ITRS

Principal Investigator(s) may request partial salary support at an annual amount not to exceed 25% academic year salary plus two months' summer support.

P-o-C/P

Principal Investigator(s) may request partial salary support at an amount not to exceed one month of academic year or summer support. Requested salary must be strongly justified based on project needs.

**Support Personnel**

If funds for graduate or undergraduate assistants, postdoctoral researchers, visiting faculty, etc., are requested, their roles in accomplishing objectives of the program must be clearly identified, and the budget must clearly show the percentage of time they will be involved and the rate of pay. **The principal investigator must request the Board's prior approval to compensate support personnel, including postdoctoral research associates, research technicians, and/or graduate assistants, at higher levels than those requested in the proposal and/or specified by the funding stipulations for a grant.**

**Current annual or academic year salaries (FY 2015-16) for principal and co-principal investigators and support personnel requesting salary support must be stated in the proposal.** Moreover, if salary support is requested, the applicants must certify that: (1) Support Fund monies will not supplant State funds; and (2) full-time employees will not, under any circumstances, receive funds in excess of 100% of their regular salary through Support Fund monies. Institutions are encouraged to supplement salaries, if necessary, in the form of an institutional match.

**No-cost extensions granted by the Board will not entitle principal or co-principal investigators to rebudget funds for additional salary support.**

**e. Support for Graduate Education**

Graduate assistant funding requested from the Board or pledged as an institutional and/or private match must be maintained in full if a proposal is recommended for funding. If suitable graduate students are not available, the principal investigator must request the Board's prior approval to rebudget these funds, and may use them for the support of postdoctoral researchers, technical personnel, and/or qualified student workers only.

Support Fund money may not be requested to pay tuition or fringe benefits for graduate assistants or graduate and undergraduate student workers. However, tuition and fringe benefits for graduate and/or undergraduate students may be provided as part of an institution's match.



**f. Equipment**

Equipment may be requested only in the context of the particular research initiative proposed and the request must contain, at a minimum, a cash match equal to or greater than 25% of the total cost of the requested equipment. Applicants should note that, when all else is equal, priority will be given to proposals with a match greater than the minimum. If equipment is requested, the proposal must contain: (1) a description of the equipment, as well as who would use it and in what capacity; (2) a plan for shared use, if appropriate; (3) a plan for the technical operation and maintenance of the equipment both during the award period and after the Support Fund award ends; and (4) a justification of need for the equipment. Note that equipment must be retained and owned by the institution.

6. **CURRENT AND PENDING SUPPORT/HISTORY OF SUPPORT:** Applicants **must** complete both the “Current and Pending Support” form, and the “History of Support” form, both available in LOGAN. The “History of Support” form must describe, at a minimum, the last five years of support.

**NOTE:** Where appropriate on either or both forms, the applicant must include information [including the BoRSF contract number(s)] about all previous Support Fund awards received for which he or she was either the principal investigator or a co-principal investigator. If such awards have been received, the applicant must either declare that this is a continuation proposal or explain thoroughly why this is not a continuation proposal and why it should not be required to conform to the requirements of Section III.M.2 of this RFP.

7. **BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH:** Biographical sketches for all key personnel and consultants (if appropriate) are limited to two pages and must be provided in the form available in LOGAN.
8. **PROPOSAL APPENDIX:** Essential material supplementary to the text of the proposal should be uploaded as a single .pdf document. The appendix must be referenced in the proposal narrative, and under no circumstances may the total page count for all materials exceed 15 pages (ITRS) and 10 pages (P-o-C/P). All material must be submitted in LOGAN; supplementary documents (published books, compact disks, printed photos, etc.) will not be accepted.

**a. Attachments/Supplemental Information**

All general supporting materials (e.g., charts, photos) to which reference is made in the narrative section must be clearly marked and included in this section.

**b. Letters of Support**

ITRS

Although the applicant ultimately must decide whether letters of support are needed, their addition is strongly encouraged in instances where (1) the support of industry is required to conduct the research; and (2) an agency (other than the applicant's employing institution) or a person (other than the project personnel) will assist or collaborate in the research in some manner. Either in the letter of support or in a separate statement, the extent to which the collaborating agency and/or individual will assist or collaborate must be made clear. Additionally, if the agency or person is to be paid from money provided by the Support Fund, the rate of pay should be included in the budget justification.

Letters of support that are forwarded to the Board's office separately from the full proposal—either before or after submission--will not be accepted. Letters of support indicating private-sector involvement are strongly encouraged for Industrial Ties Research Subprogram applicants.

P-o-C/P

All letters of interest/support from potential users/developers/investors of the concept/prototype are strongly encouraged. Letters are to be included at the end of the proposal, and are not considered part of the ten-page project narrative. A letter of support from the Pls' Department Chair, College Dean, or Center Director that reflects commitment of the principal investigator's and other investigator'(s) time and effort to achieve the goals of the project is required.

## **APPENDIX A**

### **SAMPLE PROPOSAL EVALUATION FORMS**

Form 6.61: ITRS Subject-Area Review Form (Science/Engineering Areas)

Form 6.62: ITRS Subject-Area Review Form (Non-Science/Non-Engineering Areas)

Form 6.63: P-o-C/P Subject-Area Review Form

OUT-OF-STATE REVIEWERS' PROPOSAL EVALUATION FORM

**DUE DATE:**  
BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND  
INDUSTRIAL TIES RESEARCH SUBPROGRAM (ITRS)  
Science/Engineering Subject Areas

PLEASE NOTE: This critique will be used, along with other assessments, to determine whether a proposal merits funding. The higher the score, the more clearly the proposal satisfies the criterion under consideration. Please place qualitative comments in the appropriate places. Use additional sheets as necessary.

**A. RESEARCH INNOVATION AND SCIENTIFIC RIGOR (Using national standards of excellence)**

- Extent to which proposal shows innovation and potential to advance the state of the art in science, engineering, or technology
- Extent to which the procedures and research methods are clear, appropriate and realistic within the amount of time proposed
- Extent to which the objectives are clearly defined and can be accomplished by the proposed approach

**SUBTOTAL A:** \_\_\_\_\_ of 35 points

**COMMENTS:**

**B. CONTRIBUTION TO ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

- Evaluation of the expected economic impact of the proposed study in general
- Evaluation of the expected economic impact of the proposed study to the Louisiana economy
- Does the project have significant potential for:
  - a. The establishment of a new business or industry
    - i. Evaluation of the potential for commercial use of research results within the Louisiana economy
    - ii. Extent to which technology-based business would be interested in the project
  - b. The enhancement of existing business or industry
    - i. Evaluation of the extent to which the proposed project would establish a new relationship between the researchers and one or more corporate sponsors (rather than simply reinforce--or subsidize--an existing relationship)
    - ii. Evaluation of the extent to which the project is part of a coherent plan for expanding university R & D activities in this area over a multi-year period
- Extent to which the principal investigator has demonstrated private-sector involvement and/or support

**SUBTOTAL B:** \_\_\_\_\_ of 30 points

**COMMENTS:**

**C. POTENTIAL FOR SUCCESS**

- Training, past performance, and potential of the investigators
- Extent to which institutional commitment, support, and capabilities suggest high potential for success
- Extent to which the personnel have been appropriately assigned to specific tasks

**SUBTOTAL C:** \_\_\_\_\_ of 25 points

**COMMENTS:**

**D. APPROPRIATENESS OF BUDGET**

- Reasonable for scope of work to be performed
- Appropriate for personnel costs
- Appropriate for equipment/supply costs

**SUBTOTAL D:** \_\_\_\_\_ of 10 points

**COMMENTS:**

**TOTAL SCORE (A through D):** \_\_\_\_\_ of 100 Points

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:**

**OVERALL RATING OF PROPOSAL**

Poor      Fair      Good      Very Good      Excellent

\_\_\_\_\_

=====

I agree to maintain in confidence any information, documentation and material of any kind (hereinafter referred to as "Material") included in this proposal; I further agree not to disclose, divulge, publish, file patent application on, claim ownership of, exploit or make any other use whatsoever of said "Material" without the written permission of the principal investigator. To the best of my knowledge, no conflict of interest is created as a result of my reviewing this research proposal.

Reviewer's Name Institution: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer's Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

OUT-OF-STATE REVIEWERS' PROPOSAL EVALUATION FORM

**DUE DATE:**

BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND  
INDUSTRIAL TIES RESEARCH SUBPROGRAM  
Non-Science/Non-Engineering Subject Areas

PLEASE NOTE: This critique will be used, along with other assessments, to determine whether a proposal merits funding. The higher the score, the more clearly the proposal satisfies the criterion under consideration. Please place qualitative comments in the appropriate places. Use additional sheets as necessary.

**A. RESEARCH INNOVATION AND ACADEMIC/INTELLECTUAL RIGOR (Using national standards of excellence)**

- Extent to which proposal demonstrates conceptual originality and clear potential to advance the quality and/or availability of Louisiana's academic and/or cultural resources
- Extent to which the procedures and research methods are clear, appropriate and realistic within the amount of time proposed
- Extent to which the objectives are clearly defined and can be accomplished by the proposed approach

**SUBTOTAL A:** \_\_\_\_\_ of 35 points

**COMMENTS:**

**B. SIGNIFICANCE OF PROJECT AND CONTRIBUTION TO ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

- Extent to which the proposed research will have a broad positive impact on State/National academic and/or cultural resources
- Extent to which the proposed research addresses an important problem or need and represents an improvement upon, or a valid departure from, existing practice
- Extent to which the project will yield products and/or outcomes that can be disseminated and/or utilized in other settings, such as information, materials, processes, or techniques
- Extent to which the applicant attempted to explain how the project would promote and/or enhance economic development in the State

**SUBTOTAL B:** \_\_\_\_\_ of 30 points

**COMMENTS:**

**C. POTENTIAL FOR SUCCESS**

- Training, past performance, and potential of the principal investigators
- 2Extent to which institutional commitment, support, and capabilities suggest high potential for success
- Extent to which the personnel have been appropriately assigned to specific tasks
- Extent to which the applicant(s) have demonstrated a commitment to the project and a capacity to continue or build upon the project when Support Fund assistance ends
- Extent to which the proposal offers the strong prospect of attracting private-sector and/or Federal funds or presents a plan to leverage Support Fund dollars in the manner most appropriate to the proposal. List possible sources: \_\_\_\_\_

**SUBTOTAL C:** \_\_\_\_\_ **of 25 points**

**COMMENTS:**

**D. APPROPRIATENESS OF BUDGET**

- Reasonable for scope of work to be performed
- Appropriate for personnel costs
- Appropriate for all other costs, especially equipment and supplies

**SUBTOTAL D:** \_\_\_\_\_ **of 10 points**

**COMMENTS:**

**TOTAL SCORE (A through D):** \_\_\_\_\_ **of 100 Points**

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:**

**OVERALL RATING OF PROPOSAL**

|       |       |       |           |           |
|-------|-------|-------|-----------|-----------|
| Poor  | Fair  | Good  | Very Good | Excellent |
| _____ | _____ | _____ | _____     | _____     |

=====

I agree to maintain in confidence any information, documentation and material of any kind (hereinafter referred to as "Material") included in this proposal; I further agree not to disclose, divulge, publish, file patent application on, claim ownership of, exploit or make any other use whatsoever of said "Material" without the written permission of the principal investigator. To the best of my knowledge, no conflict of interest is created as a result of my reviewing this research proposal.

Reviewer's Name and Institution: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer's Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_



OUT-OF-STATE MAIL REVIEWERS' PROPOSAL EVALUATION FORM

**DUE DATE:**

BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND

PROOF-OF-CONCEPT/PROTOTYPE (P-o-C/P) INITIATIVE

Subject Area \_\_\_\_\_

PLEASE NOTE: This critique will be used to determine whether a proposal merits funding. The higher the score, the more clearly the proposal satisfies the criterion under consideration. Please place qualitative comments in the appropriate places. Use additional sheets as necessary.

**A. TECHNICAL MERIT – 40 POINTS MAXIMUM**

- Innovation is reduced to practice and is not subject to near-term obsolescence
- Suitability of R&D methods, procedures and budget
- Scope of work is consistent with timeline and budget
- Reasonableness of project milestones and projected project outcomes

**SUBTOTAL A \_\_\_\_\_ of 40**

**B. COMMERCIAL OPPORTUNITY – 40 POINTS MAXIMUM**

- Disruptive product or significant improvement over existing commercial solutions
- Potential scope of intellectual property protection
- Compelling justification for the need to explore commercial viability
- Evidence of commercial viability and documented need for further R&D

**SUBTOTAL B \_\_\_\_\_ of 40**

**C. POTENTIAL FOR SUCCESS – 20 POINTS MAXIMUM**

- Demonstration of interest by potential users/commercial partners
- Size and scope of potential target market or patent application filed
- Prior art search completed, with meaningful scope of claims

**SUBTOTAL C \_\_\_\_\_ of 20**

**TOTAL POINTS \_\_\_\_\_ of 100**